UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,767	12/13/2005	Eugene S. Rubin	20030073	5153
22500 BAE SYSTEM	7590 08/12/201 S	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 868	02061 0060	BONZELL, PHILIP J		
NASHUA, NH 03061-0868			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/560,767	RUBIN, EUGENE S.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	THEN O. BONZELL	0044
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(: Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection filed after a filed afte	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	:	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-9,14,16-18 and 20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		r be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered buseline continuation sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Tien Dinh/	/PHILIP J BONZELL/	
Primary Examiner, AU 3644	Examiner, Art Unit 3644	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation Sheet:

With respect to the amendments to the claims, they overcome the 112 rejection and are being entered.

With respect to the first argument on pages 11-12 that Czarnecki '039 is not a proper combination as it teaches providing infrared directly out from the aircraft to sacrifice non-essential portions of the aircraft to incoming missiles, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Czarnecki '039 clearly teaches that it is well know to use a direct infrared signal out into space that is strong enough to attract an incoming missile from the infrared signature of the aircraft. This is the concept that is being used to modify Bull '295 which would could then be used as a decoy infrared seeking missiles instead of RF seeking missiles.

With respect to the second argument on pages 12-13 that Loucks '132 is not a proper combination as just because using an engine obscurant is known that it is not obvious to combine it with a decoy, the Examiner respectfuly disagrees. All of the prior art used has the main goal to protect an aircraft from missiles, whethr it is with a decoy or using and engine obscurant. The Examiner holds that it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an engine obscurant on an aircraft with a decoy as this would only further help keep an aircraft safe from a missile as the engines infrared signature would be decreased which would increase the difference in infrared signatures between the aircraft and the decoy, thus making the decoy more of an attractive target to the incoming missile.